2/12/72

Dear Howard,

Your letter to Rhoads worked beautifully. You spotted t e key thing correctly. I have recently written about this and gotten no answer and I have long correspondence that assured me I have everything medical, of whatever nature, and it does not include this. Unless he erred it can't be the panel's inventory, and the autopsy-docs report has no inventory. Perhaps you should ask for two copies. I have to be careful in using files and I want to get this out today, so if there are other points, I'll look for them when I file your response from him (may I please have a second copy, one for the file on this operation and one for the Archives files?)

Sorry I do not recall the Horowitz artcile. If I think or it or find it, I'll send it.

Your letter to Sylvia is good. I woll regard it as confidential. But I think you also should be asking yourself why, if she has the kind of strong view she has expressed to you, she has steadfastly refused to express them to me or to engage in a dialogue with me on the subject. I did invite it, as you know. There is one thing you might well have added to your good letter, that from what you have seen of what I have gotten that was not had by the Warren Commission (please empahsize this because I do not want others continually trailing around behind me picking uo my crumbs), you can't think af anything really new we can lear now from seeing the X-ray and pix. Why else does she think they let anybody see them and run that risk? When there was no need, no demand, no obligation, and less interest in the subject than ever before.

I think it is fine that she has offered to help you with her publisher contacts, something again, and again in confidence, she has never, ever done or offered for me, from the beginning, when she read the limitaed xerox edition of WW. She did once refer me to Ramparts and she offered to condense the panl part of PM II into a mag piece for the NYReview, an immature futility.

I think if you have further dialogue on this you should try and put truth in a context, not regard it in the abstract, not purely in the limited form. I used the Cicero(?) quote in F-U in a broader sense. And the truth <u>has</u> been told. There is some jealousy by those who did not see it when it was told, I fear. And everything we can reasonably expect not then told is not in a position to be told, in the completed PM, but there is no help from those of means and such lofty and noble and entirely unselfish principle, is there? Not even for editing or blue-pencilling. You shpuld also add to the defense of the guilty the record they have made for this day. You have seen some of Specter's and Moover's in my ownk, if not elsewhere. I have no objection to your giving her an appraisal of what I have put together with what I got (again emphasize not from the Archives), but I now want absolutely no disclosure of any of the contents to anyone. You can add, as I think you will recall, that I have carried this further and have pinned the fact of and the guilt for the destruction of evidence on these really guilty of it, those in a fine position to be exculpated. (She has never asked to read it and I now will not let her. I think I offered it.)

While there may be other reasons, I remain to be persuaded that this Lattimer ploy was not designed to make any commercial consideration of PM impossible. I have now a glimmer of another ploy on another thing I have been forcing on. They may be taling a new step in a new direction. If I am right, that may be even trickier.

Well, I've raised the question of selfishness, so let me carry it a bit further, to go no further, under any circumstances. I may not have told you, but more than a year ago, when I began to fear the potential, I asked Cyril to join me in what I regarded and still regard as a safe and dramatic way to blow this thing. I then had enough in my possession, and there then, as now, was and is a good possibility. I could not do it myself, nor could he. He did not respond, although we exhanged many letters thereafter. He refused to be a witness for me in the clothing/pix suit, on the ground that it would cost him money! He

stopped doing anything except telling me how great I am and how indebted everyone is to me once he learned enough about my new work and had (and made copies of) some of my new pictures. You should recall that he never did send me the pages from the standard texts on spectro and neutro he promised. I wanted his criminalists judgement, not mine, on what is a good standard source. By the way, if you can ever get these things at your library, of if there is a faculty member there who can tell you which are the more highly regarded texts, I'd appreciate it for the spectro appeal (with which neither Cyril nor anyone else has been of any help or expressed any interest).

Am I not fairly past the point where I must ask myself what motive who has? There is something to which many of us are susceptible: wanting to get credit for and go down in history as the one who broke the damned thing ope-all alone. Garrison is the extreme and crude form. Cyril, I am now certain, great as he he, sees a way of doing it on the cheap, without any real work -wheich he has never done -that costs money - and with the enormous financial and professional benefit it would yield. remember, he has a private building in the Frick Building. He does take malpractise cases. This may not be his conscious. But his refusal to enter into a dialogue and his self-serving letters incline me to think it is. This has nothing to do with whether or not he is great, as he is, and it is not what today is regarded as a reprehensible thing, except by old fogies like me.

I think this stepx, this letter, ratger, marks an important step for you. Sylvia is a trult remarkable persona with a magnificent mind. But like all of us, she has her own hangups. One is young men, I suspect because she was childless in her marriage. One if as you have addressed on "truth", like Haliburton climbing a mountain ti spit from the top to me. Like all brilliant people, she has come to have justified faith in her own judgement and opinions. But she has been so far out of it for so long that she is not able to make judgements except in terms of the past. She also has a dominating personality. I think contact with her, because of her enormous giftsx and fine character can be of great benefit to you. But it must be an independent relationship in which, as with me, you maintain your own positions and do not permit domination or being overwhelmed. Her judgement recently has been faulted too often. Compare, for example, my forecast on Belin when you started writing him, the present flap. Thornley, Lifton and others than may come to mind. Even I, impulsive as I am and with the awful haste with which I do things have a better record. I'll <u>today</u> stake the results of mine on Garrison against hers, which did absolutely no good and may have done harm. I did have some accomplishments, I did prevent worse. I do not have to worry about your independence with me. It exists. I tell you these things so that, in your own quiet way, as in this good letter, you will assert and maintain it with her. Though she has been too often wrong, it mx is not because she is not one of the most exceptional people I have ever met. Even today, all the things that have happened, including her financial help to those she should have and I think then did know were my enemies, my enormous respect and regard for herx and entirely undiminished. She is a towering person, and she can be really beneficial to you in your still-formative years. Yet I caution you to another appraisal of the present situation. Make your own evaluation. In this case I encapsulate mine: it is an antiOintellectual attitude and position, one in which all possibility of learning the other side is automatically and immediately foreclosed. If you agree, do not forget it. Thanks for the great help with heads, and make your own evaluation of my letter to Vawter-and what it may betoken on their part. Best,